UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION

DYDM IRREVOCABLE LIVING TRUST,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 4:25-cy-00507-P

NEWREZ LLC,

Defendant.

ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

On June 18, 2025, the United States Magistrate Judge issued Findings, Conclusions, and a Recommendation (FCR) in this case. ECF No. 12. The FCR recommended the Court dismiss Plaintiff's case because he failed to comply with the Court's order to file an amended complaint and register for electronic court filing (ECF). A Magistrate Judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendations for a dispositive matter are reviewed *de novo* if a party timely objects. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). Plaintiff filed an Objection to the FCR on June 23, 2025. ECF No. 14. The Court accordingly conducted a *de novo* review of the FCR.

The Magistrate Judge ordered that Plaintiff file an amended complaint and either "comply with the local rules or file a motion for exemption from the ECF requirements" by June 6, 2025, or risk dismissal of the case. ECF No. 5 at 2–3. Plaintiff objects that he was "unaware" that he was required to take those actions. ECF No. 14 ¶ 3. But Plaintiff is charged with full knowledge of the Court's orders. See Shaunfield v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc., No. 3:12-cv-4686-M, 2008 WL 4692436, at *2 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 21, 2008). Further, the docket reflects that Plaintiff was given notice by mail of the Court's order to replead. And none of his arguments justify excusing his failure to follow the Court's

orders. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the reasoning of the Magistrate Judge and **DISMISSES** the above-captioned case **without prejudice**.

SO ORDERED on this 8th day of July 2025.

Mark T. Pittman

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE